



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/998,037	11/29/2001	Ashwani Garg	267/186	6073

8791 7590 03/15/2005

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER

PANNALA, SATHYANARAYA R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2167

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/998,037

Applicant(s)

GARG ET AL.

Examiner

Sathyanarayan Pannala

Art Unit

2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 23-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 23-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of the claims drawn to generating database or data structure, classified in class 707, subclass 102, in the reply filed on 5/24/2004 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even if it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions. Claims in Group I deal with generating a plurality of information items associated with a computer application and drawn to Generating Database or data structure, classified in Class 707, subclass 102. Whereas claims in Group II distributing a plurality of information items and drawn to Distributed or remote access, classified in Class 707, subclass 10. Claims in Group III deal with defining an identifier for use in a distributed application and drawn to Database schema or data structures, classified in Class 707, subclass 100. This is not found persuasive because claims in Groups I-III inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper, see MPEP 821.

2. Claims 9-22 and 31-39 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable

generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 5/24/2004.

3. Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-8 and 23-30 in Group I, in the reply filed on 5/24/2004 is acknowledged. Claims 1-8 and 23-30 are pending in this Office Action.

Priority

4. Applicant is claiming the benefit of priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) since a U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/329,058 is filed on 10/12/2001. So, the examiner honors the priority as per statutory law.

Specification

5. The summary of the invention is not included in the specification. A summary is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. See MPEP §§ 608.01(d).

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in

upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC (See 37 CFR 1.52(e)(5) and MPEP 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)), and tables having more than 50 pages of text are permitted to be submitted on compact discs.) or REFERENCE TO A "MICROFICHE APPENDIX" (See MPEP § 608.05(a). "Microfiche Appendices" were accepted by the Office until March 1, 2001.)
- (e) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
 - (1) Field of the Invention.
 - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (f) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (g) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (h) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (i) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (j) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1-8 and 23-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koubenski et al. (USPA Pub. 2003/0069737A1) hereinafter Koubenski, and in view of Gibbs et al. (US Patent 6,169,725) hereinafter Gibbs.

8. As per independent claims 1 and 23, Koubenski teaches a method and system for dynamically determining a set of relevant rule instances or rules, given a set of context attribute values form a hierarchically-specified rule data store specifying inheritance relationships using conflict resolution consistent with the inheritance principles (page 1, paragraph [0008]). Koubenski teaches the claimed step of "generating a plurality of local identifier components" as each operational limit of an organization may be assigned with a local unique identifier (Fig. 3, page 2, paragraph [0028]). "generating a plurality of identifiers by associating each of the plurality of local identifier components and the set label component" the local identifier is used in conjunction with organization unique identifier (Fig. 3, page 2, paragraph[0028]). Koubenski teaches the claimed step of "and associating the plurality of identifiers with

the plurality of information items” as unique identifiers identify the object are independent of the company it makes the product and/or provides the service (Fig. 3, page 2, paragraph [0028]). Koubenski does not explicitly teach label components associated with computer application. However, Gibbs teaches the claimed step of “associating one or more set label components with the computer application” as device control modules (DCMs) label their internal connections as permanent, non-HAVI, and active-HAVI (Fig. 6, 8, col. 13, lines 1-5). Gibbs and Koubenski both teach unique identifiers and local identifiers. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Gibbs’ teachings would have allowed Koubenski’s in associating labels with computer application/module and unique identifier would have automatically monitors and establishes the proper internal/external connection which is transparent to the user and requires minimum effort and knowledge on the part of the user (col. 2, lines 55-61).

9. As per dependent claims 2 and 24, Koubenski teaches the claimed step of “the plurality of local identifier components is sequentially generated” from the Fig. 3, as an example, leaf nodes are listed by elements 2112, 2114 and 2116 in the sequence of 1.1.1, 1.1.2 and 1.1.3 respectively in sequence (Fig. 2-3, page 2, paragraph [0024]).

10. As per dependent claims 3 and 25, Koubenski teaches the claimed step of “each of the plurality local identifier components is unique within a set label component” as

each operational limit of an organization may be assigned with a local unique identifier (Fig. 3, page 2, paragraph [0028]).

11. As per dependent claims 4 and 26, Koubenski teaches the claimed step of “each of the identifiers uniquely identifies an information stream” the buyer organization chart shows an organization for buyer (Fig. 2, page 2, paragraph [0024]).

12. As per dependent claims 5 and 27, Koubenski does not explicitly teach label components associated with computer application. However, Gibbs teaches the claimed step of “providing a status identifier component indicating a status of the identifier set and generating the plurality of identifiers by linking each of the plurality of local identifier components, the status identifier component, and the set label component” as each internal connection is according to its status (col. 3, lines 21-23). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Gibbs’ teachings would have allowed Koubenski’s in associating labels with computer application/module and unique identifier would have automatically monitors and establishes the proper internal/external connection which is transparent to the user and requires minimum effort and knowledge on the part of the user (col. 2, lines 55-61).

13. As per dependent claims 6 and 28, Koubenski does not explicitly teach label components associated with computer application. However, Gibbs teaches the

claimed step of "the status identifier component can indicate one of an active status or standby status" as each internal connection is according to its status as active or inactive (col. 3, lines 21-23). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Gibbs' teachings would have allowed Koubenski's in associating labels with computer application/module and unique identifier would have automatically monitors and establishes the proper internal/external connection which is transparent to the user and requires minimum effort and knowledge on the part of the user (col. 2, lines 55-61).

14. As per dependent claims 7 and 29, Koubenski does not explicitly teach label components associated with computer application. However, Gibbs teaches the claimed step of "each of the plurality of local identifier components and the set label component comprise one or more binary bits" as a global unique identifier (GUID) is a 64-bit quantity used to uniquely identify a device it consists of a 24-bit vendor ID and a 40-bit serial number assigned by the device manufacturer Fig. 8, col. 11, lines 35-37). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Gibbs' teachings would have allowed Koubenski's in associating labels with computer application/module and unique identifier would have automatically monitors and establishes the proper internal/external connection which is transparent to the user and requires minimum effort and knowledge on the part of the user (col. 2, lines 55-61).


15. As per dependent claims 8 and 30, Koubenski does not explicitly teach label components associated with computer application. However, Gibbs teaches the claimed step of "the plurality of identifiers are generated by attaching each of the local identifiers components to the set label components" as device control modules(DCMs) label their internal connections as permanent, non-HAVI, and active-HAVI (Fig. 6, 8, col. 13, lines 1-5). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Gibbs' teachings would have allowed Koubenski's in associating labels with computer application/module and unique identifier would have automatically monitors and establishes the proper internal/external connection which is transparent to the user and requires minimum effort and knowledge on the part of the user (col. 2, lines 55-61).

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sathyanarayan Pannala whose telephone number is (571) 272-4115. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Sathyanarayan Pannala
Examiner
Art Unit 2167

srp
March 4, 2005


SATHYANARAYAN
PANNALA